Department of the Army
U.S. Army Engineer District, St. Louis
Corps of Engineers
210 Tucker Boulevard, North
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

LMSED-BP

29 July 1981

AUG 05 1981

Mr. Edward C. Vest
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
324 East 11th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Dear Mr. Vest:

I am writing to thank you for your agency's participation at the Pine Ford Scoping meeting of 8 July. This letter, with its inclosures, will also serve to document the proceedings of that meeting.

The bulk of the group's discussion centered around heavy metals contamination and other water quality problems. Inclosure 1 includes points of discussion and areas for future coordination that surfaced at the meeting. I have also included inclosures on the project's authorization and on the scoping process, as requested by meeting attendees.

A meeting of U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Conservation and Corps Personnel is being arranged for 12 August 1981 in Jefferson City to further scope fish and wildlife considerations. Additional meetings will follow. These meetings may also be limited as to the topic to be addressed or the disciplines involved in order to reduce the number of attendees to facilitate discussion. In any event, you will be kept fully informed on the outcome of all scoping meetings.

I look forward to continued cooperation between our two agencies.

Sincerely,

SIGNED
Jack R. Niemi

JACK R. NIEMI, P.E.
Chief, Engineering Division

3 Incl
As stated

Copy Furnished:
Mr. Bob Fenemore

40111342
SUPERFUND RECORDS

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION
PINE FORD SCOPING MEETING
8 JULY 1981

1. Attendees' Requests for Additional Information.

a. Written definition of study's area and scope (to be furnished later).

b. Listing of potential alternatives with more specific geographic locations (to be furnished later).

c. Definition of scoping process (furnished).

d. Copy of authorizing language (furnished).

e. Projections for Mo. D.O.C.'s population figures (to be furnished later).

f. Copy of National Park Service's recreation study requested by U.S.F.W.S. (furnished).

g. Hood of DNR requested a copy of NPS's response to DNR's comments on the recreation study (furnished).

h. The Corps requested any publications, reports or other data which pertained to the study area.

2. Attendees' Offers of Information and Assistance.

a. The following individuals offered to assist and/or observe at the Citizen Advisory Panel Meeting:

Bachant	(MDOC)*
Bedan	(MDNR)
Cook	(USFWS)*
Carter	(St. Joe Minerals)

*also offered to be facilitator at public meetings.

b. Mo. D.O.C. offered to host scoping meeting at Jefferson City for fish and wildlife and environmental considerations (tentatively set for 12 August 1981).

c. Mo. D.O.C. offered data from Fleener recreation study (offer accepted).

d. Area 8 S.C.S. offered results of public participation program on future problems and needs (offer accepted) and existing soil surveys within the lower Meramec flood plain.

e. EPA offered to be a cooperating agency (offer under consideration).

Incl 1

f. EPA offered to furnish a schedule for the updating of sewage treatment plants within the Big River basin.

g. DNR offered copies of 1980 Missouri SCORP (since received).

h. The Mo. D.O.C. offered the Corps an opportunity to make a presentation at the last of their public information meetings to be held somewhere on the Big River later this summer (offer accepted).

3. Comments on Heavy Metals/Water Quality.

a. Discussions indicated that four metals have been detected within the stream's water which could cause problems to both man and animal. The metals are lead, a problem because of its toxicity; cadmium, also toxic; barium, because in covering the streambed it kills aquatic life (little is known about Barium with regard to toxicity); and manganese which may also be toxic.

b. Preliminary results of Schmitt's studies indicate that lead and cadmium become associated with organic material as they pass through the river system and may thus be converted to a more biologically active form.

c. Poorly treated sewage and suspended materials from gravel operations could provide some of that organic matter.

d. Studies underway which could further define the nature of the problem include the University of Missouri's study on animals which eat aquatic wildlife and the Missouri Division of Health's study on blood lead levels in fishermen.

e. Several remedial measures were advanced:

(1) Vineyard (DNR) stated that the barite remaining in the tailing ponds may be reprocessed resulting in new, more stable dams in accordance with state requirements. (BOM stated that it is not economically feasible to reclaim lead tailings).

(2) A pilot program for revegetation of lead tailings is currently being conducted by the Bureau of Mines.

(3) Stabilization of tailings piles by flattening the side slopes may prevent large slides.

(4) A portion of the lead tailings could be pumped back into old mines. No one seemed to know what effect this might have on ground water or how economically feasible it might be.

(5) The possibility of using the EPA Superfund was discussed since both lead and cadmium exist in concentrations which could constitute a hazardous waste. However, the present law/regulation specifically excludes its use for primary and secondary mining activity. It is possible, although not probable, that this exclusion will be deleted.

(6) The former practice of providing farmers with free lead tailings for agricultural lime has been discontinued by St. Joe Minerals, presumably to avoid liability for any adverse effects.

f. EPA can provide a schedule for the cleanup of sewage treatment plants in the Big River basin. The outlook for construction grants is becoming increasingly less favorable. Even with upgraded facilities, problems may continue because there is no way to assure competent operation.

g. It was generally agreed that lead could potentially be taken up by crops within the flood plain.

h. It was generally agreed that a study was needed to identify all sources of heavy metals contamination within the Big River.

i. None of the attendees knew the current status of negotiations between the State of Missouri and St. Joe Minerals with respect to the 1977 failure of the Deslodge tailings pile.

4. Other Comments.

a. Mo. DNR reiterated its disagreement with certain aspects of the Corp's water supply study.

b. Mo. DNR also reiterated concerns with:

(1) The standards used for the recreation study performed by the National Park Service for the Corps.

(2) The fact that the Corps procedure for quantifying benefits did not take into consideration the existing recreational use of the stream.

c. Mo. DNR also reiterated the current belt tightening by the state and the state's legal difficulties with making long-term financial commitments. Both could affect the state's ability to sponsor portions of the project.

d. Both S.C.S. and Mo. D.O.C. indicated a need for land treatment within the basin.

e. S.C.S. stated that soils mapping does not exist for most of the Big River Basin and only scattered soils mapping is available on the lower Meramec River.

f. Mo. D.O.C. voiced concern that impacts to the basin's forestry resource be considered.

g. EPA suggested that small reservoirs also be investigated.

h. Some attendees expressed concern that wells may not be a viable water supply alternative for the Flat River area in light of recent contamination discovered in the area's groundwater.

CEQ NEPA regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508). The planning process described in these Principles and Standards and the CEQ NEPA regulations are complementary.

§ 711.13 Interdisciplinary planning.

An interdisciplinary approach is to be used in planning to ensure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts. The disciplines of the planners are to be appropriate to the scope and issues identified in the scoping process (see § 711.16). The planning agency is to supplement its available expertise, as necessary, with knowledgeable experts from cooperating agencies, universities, consultants, etc.

§ 711.14 Agency decisionmaking.

(a) Decisionmaking is a dynamic and iterative process that leads to selection of a recommended plan. Decisionmaking begins at the field level and occurs at different levels through subsequent reviews and necessary approvals as required by the agency until it reaches the level having authority to approve the project (final level). The individual in the responsible planning agency making the decisions at each level is referred to as the "agency decisionmaker." The identity of the agency decisionmaker depends upon the level of project development and review. For projects requiring Congressional authorization, the final agency decisionmaker is the Secretary of the Department or head of the independent agency. For projects that do not require Congressional approval, the final decisionmaker is the Secretary of the Department, head of the agency, or such other official as appropriately delegated.

(b) Within the context of these Principles and Standards, the decisionmaker is responsible for making the many "judgments" referred to as well as determining what is "reasonable," "appropriate," etc.

§ 711.15 Planning area.

The planning area is a geographic space with an identified boundary that includes:

(a) The area identified in the study's authorizing document;

(b) The locations of resources included in the study's identified problems and opportunities;

(c) The locations of alternative plans, often called "project areas;" and

(d) The locations of resources that would be directly, indirectly, or cumulatively affected by alternative plans, often called the "affected area."

§ 711.16 Scoping.

(a) Planning is to include an early and open process termed "scoping" to identify both the likely significant issues to be addressed and the range of those issues. The agency is to begin scoping as soon as practicable after a decision to begin planning and prior to completing the inventory. The scoping process includes affected Federal, State, and local agencies and other interested groups or persons. Scoping is to be used as appropriate throughout planning to ensure that all significant decisionmaking factors are addressed and that unneeded and extraneous studies are not undertaken.

(b) As part of the scoping process the agency is to:

(1) Determine the extent to which the likely significant issues are to be analyzed.

(2) Define the planning area based on the problems and opportunities and the geographic areas likely to be affected by alternative plans.

(3) Identify and eliminate from detailed study any issues that are not significant or that have been adequately covered by prior study. However, important issues, even though covered by other studies, are still to be considered in the analysis.

(4) Identify any current or future planning that is related to but not part of the study under consideration.

(5) Identify review and consultation requirements so that cooperating agencies (as defined in 40 CFR 1508.5) may prepare required analyses and studies concurrently with the study under consideration.

(6) Indicate the tentative planning and decisionmaking schedule.

(7) Hold an early scoping meeting or meetings. The scoping meetings may be integrated with other early planning meetings.

(8) Repeat the above steps if there is a substantial change in the planning emphasis or if new circumstances or information make the repetition necessary.

(c) Scoping may be used to combine or narrow the number of problems, opportunities, measures, plans, effects, etc., under consideration so that meaningful and efficient analysis and choice among alternative plans can occur.

(d) Scoping is to include consideration of ground water problems and opportunities, including conjunctive use of ground and surface water, and instream flow needs. Appropriate consideration is to be given to existing water rights in scoping the planning effort.

§ 711.17 Forecasting.

(a) Formulation and evaluation of alternative plans are to be based on the most likely conditions expected to exist in the future with and without the plan. The without-plan condition is the condition expected to prevail if no action is taken. The with-plan condition is the condition expected to prevail with the particular plan under consideration.

(b) The forecasts of with- and without-plan conditions shall use the inventory of existing conditions as the baseline, and are to be based on considerations of the following (including direct, indirect, and cumulative effects)—

(1) The national/regional projections of income, employment, output, and population prepared and published by or for the Water Resources Council;

(2) Other aggregate projections such as exports, land use trends, and amounts of goods and services likely to be demanded;

(3) Expected environmental conditions; and

(4) Specific, authoritative projections for small areas.

Appropriate national and regional projections should be used as an underlying forecasting framework, and inconsistencies therewith, while permissible, should be documented and justified.

(c) National projections used in planning are to be based on a full employment economy. In this context, assumption of a full employment economy establishes a rationale for general use of market prices in estimating economic benefits and costs, but does not preclude consideration of special analyses of regions with high rates of unemployment and underemployment in calculating benefits from using unemployed and underemployed labor resources.

(d) National and State environmental and health standards and regulations are to be recognized and appropriately considered in scoping the planning effort. Standards and regulations concerning water quality, air quality, public health, wetlands protection, and floodplain management shall be given specific consideration in forecasting the without-plan condition.

(e) Other plans that have been adopted for the planning area and other current planning efforts are to be considered.

(f) Forecasts are to be made for selected years over the period of analysis to indicate how changes in economic conditions and environmental resources are likely to have an impact on problems and opportunities.

Incl. 2

Flood Control Act of 1966

Engineers in House Document Numbered 510, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,193,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for Little Sandy River and Tygarts Creek, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 517, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $15,000,000.

The project for Taylorsville Reservoir, Salt River, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 502, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $24,800,000.

The project for Stonewall Jackson Reservoir, West Fork River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $34,500,000.

MERAMEC RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection and other purposes in the Meramec River Basin, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 525, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,971,000: *Provided*, That construction of this project shall not be initiated until the President has approved a report prepared by the Secretary of the Army reexamining the basis on which the project was formulated and the arrangements for cost sharing.

Presidential approval of report.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Maumee River at Ottawa, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 485, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,413,000.

The project for flood protection on Red Creek, Monroe County, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,430,000.

PAJARO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Pajaro River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 491, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $11,890,000.

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Klamath River at and in the vicinity of Klamath, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 478, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,460,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Boise River, vicinity of Boise, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the rec-

Incl. 3